

Analysis of Assange's argument (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UeJy001sweM>)**Atomic statements used in the argument:**

- E: The **engagement** outcome (i.e., journalists being injured and/or killed by US soldiers) is problematic.
- R: The **rules** of engagement are problematic.
- I: The US **internal military review** outcome (which says that the soldiers had not broken any rules of engagement) is problematic.
- F: The rules of engagement were **followed**.

Assange's argument can be summarized and presented as below (with suppressed/implied premises and conclusion added)

- 1. E (premise – given Assange's negative comments on the engagement outcome)
- 2. $\sim R \rightarrow (F \rightarrow \sim E)$ (suppressed premise – the idea that rules of engagement are unproblematic only if the outcome of following the rules is unproblematic)
- 3. $\sim F \rightarrow \sim I$ (suppressed premise – the idea that if rules of engagement weren't followed, then the internal review outcome is problematic).
- 4. $\sim F \vee F$ (suppressed premise – which is a logical truth)
- Conclusion: $\sim I \vee \sim R$ (suppressed conclusion – given Assange's negative comments on the US military)

Validity of Assange's argument (shown by natural deduction)

- 1. E (given)
- 2. $\sim R \rightarrow (F \rightarrow \sim E)$ (given)
- 3. $\sim F \rightarrow \sim I$ (given)
- 4. $\sim F \vee F$ (given)
- 5. $(\sim R \bullet F) \rightarrow \sim E$ (from 2, by exp)
- 6. $\sim \sim E$ (from 1, by DN)
- 7. $\sim(\sim R \bullet F)$ (from 5 and 6, by MT)
- 8. $\sim \sim R \vee \sim F$ (from 7, by DM)
- 9. $R \vee \sim F$ (from 8, by DN)
- 10. $\sim F \vee R$ (from 9, by Com)
- 11. $F \rightarrow R$ (from 10, by Imp)
- 12. $\sim I \vee \sim R$ (from 3, 4 and 10, by CD) – i.e., either the US internal military review is problematic or the rules of engagement are problematic.